



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,095	04/07/2005	Henry M Krause	1889-00900	5757
23505	7590	07/19/2007	EXAMINER	
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.			SHIN, DANA H	
David A. Rose			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P. O. BOX 3267			1635	
HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/19/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,095	KRAUSE ET AL.	
	Examiner Dana Shin	Art Unit 1635	
<b>--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>			
THE REPLY FILED 02 July 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.			
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>			
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>			
<b>NOTICE OF APPEAL</b>			
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>			
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>			
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>			
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>			
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>			
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>			
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____</p> <p>Claim(s) objected to: _____</p> <p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-13, 15-17 and 20-23</u>.</p> <p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>			
<b>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</b>			
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>			
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>			
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>			
<b>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</b>			
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:</p> <p><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>			
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p>			
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>			
<p>/J. E. Angell/ Primary Examiner AU1635</p>			



Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 10 is currently amended to recite "wherein the at least one insulator sequence is a multiple palindromic restriction site". This newly inserted claim limitation is not described in the specification as originally filed and therefore introduces new matter. Applicant argues that the specification "implicitly" describes the newly recited claim limitation. Although one might be able to infer that the paired restriction sites may mean "palindromic" restriction sites, the specification as originally filed does not adequately describe that the paired restriction sites comprise nucleotides that read the same backward and forward, that is being palindromic. Further, the specification does not describe that the insulator sequence comprises "multiple" palindromic restriction sites and how many constitutes "multiple" palindromic restriction sites. If there are multiple definitions for a term, it must be clear from the application as filed that applicant intended a particular definition. See MPEP §2163.07. In the instant case, not only does the phrase "multiple palindromic restriction site" introduce new matter, but it also introduces lack of written description.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed on July 2, 2007 are directed to the claims as "amended". To reiterate, the function of the claimed "insulator" quoted from paragraph 0102 is expressly taught by the cited prior art reference, Srisawat et al., and therefore, the claimed insulator sequence is clearly taught by Srisawat et al.